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**Despite being a common buzzword, Generative AI is a flawed promise.**

**Rosalsky 24** --- (Greg Rosalsky, 8-5-2024, [*Reporter, Planet Money Since 2018, Greg Rosalsky has been a writer and reporter at NPR's Planet Money. Before joining NPR, he spent more than five years at Freakonomics Radio, where he produced 60 episodes that were downloaded nearly 100 million times. Those included an exposé of the damage filmmaking subsidies have on American visual-effects workers, a deep dive into the successes and failures of Germany's manufacturing model, and a primer on behavioral economics, which he wrote as a satire of traditional economic thought. Among the show's most popular episodes were those he produced about personal finance, including one on why it's a bad idea for people to pick and choose stocks. Rosalsky has written freelance articles for a number of publications, including The Behavioral Scientist and Pacific Standard. An article he authored about food inequality in New York City was anthologized in Best Food Writing 2017. Rosalsky began his career in the plains of Iowa working for an underdog presidential candidate named Barack Obama and was a White House researcher during the early years of the Obama Administration. He earned a master's degree at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, where he studied economics and public policy.*], "10 reasons why AI may be overrated", https://www.npr.org/sections/planet-money/2024/08/06/g-s1-15245/10-reasons-why-ai-may-be-overrated-artificial-intelligence) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

Is artificial intelligence overrated? Ever since ChatGPTheralded the explosion of generative AI in late 2022, the technology has seen incredible hype in the industry and media. And countless **investors** have **poured** billions and **billions** of dollars into it and related companies. But a growing chorus of naysayers is expressing doubts about how game-changing generative AI will actually be for the economy. The discord over AI recently inspired a two-part series on our daily podcast, The Indicator from Planet Money. Co-host Darian Woods and I decided to debate the question: Is AI overrated or underrated? Because there is quite a bit of uncertainty over how much AI will ultimately affect the economy — and because neither of us really wanted to regret making dumb prognostications — we chose to obscure our personal opinions on the matter. We flipped an AI-generated coin to determine which side of this debate each of us would take. I got "**AI is overrated.**" I spoke to Massachusetts Institute of Technology economist Daron Acemoglu, who has emerged as one of AI's leading skeptics. I asked Acemoglu whether he thought generative AI would usher in revolutionary changes to the economy within the next decade. "No. No. Definitely not," Acemoglu said. "I mean, unless you count a lot of **companies over-investing in generative AI and then regretting it**, a revolutionary change." Ouch. That implies we've seen **a massive financial bubble inflate** before our very eyes (note that this interview was conducted before the recent stock market plunge, which may or may not have something do with expectations about AI). So why might AI be overrated? To make my polemical case, I ended up assembling a pretty long list of reasons. We couldn't fit it all in a short episode. So we decided to provide here a fuller list of reasons that AI may be overrated (complete with strongly worded arguments). Here you go: Reason 1:

**In education, its prospects are bleak.**

**Li 23** --- (Luona Li, [*Luona Lin is a research associate focusing on social and demographic research at Pew Research Center.*], 2-6-2023, "A quarter of U.S. teachers say AI tools do more harm than good in K-12 education", https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/05/15/a-quarter-of-u-s-teachers-say-ai-tools-do-more-harm-than-good-in-k-12-education/) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

As some teachers start to use artificial intelligence (AI) tools in their work, **a majority** are uncertain about or **see downsides to the general use of AI tools in K-12 education**, according to a Pew Research Center survey conducted in fall 2023. A quarter of public K-12 teachers say using AI tools in K-12 education does more harm than good. About a third (32%) say there is about an equal mix of benefit and harm, while only 6% say it does more good than harm. Another 35% say they aren’t sure. A pie chart showing that many teachers are uncertain about the use of AI tools in K-12 education. How we did this How teachers’ views differ by school level High school teachers are more likely than elementary and middle school teachers to hold negative views about AI tools in education. A bar chart showing that high school teachers are more likely than other teachers to view AI in K-12 education negatively. About a **third of high school teachers (35%) say these tools do more harm than good.** Roughly a quarter of middle school teachers (24%) and 19% of elementary school teachers say the same. **Fewer than one-in-ten teachers at all levels say these tools do more good than harm.** Some 47% of elementary school teachers say they aren’t sure about the impact of AI tools in K-12 education. That is much larger than the shares of middle and high school teachers who say this. Teens’ experiences with and views of ChatGPT In a separate survey, we asked U.S. teens about their experience with and views of ChatGPT, a generative AI tool, in their schoolwork. A bar chart showing that, Among teens who know of ChatGPT, 19% say they’ve used it for schoolwork. Among teens who have heard of ChatGPT, 19% say they have used it to help them with schoolwork. This is more common among teens in higher grades. About a quarter of 11th and 12th graders who have heard of ChatGPT (**24**%) say they have **used it in their schoolwor**k, compared with 17% of 9th and 10th graders and 12% of 7th and 8th graders. Teens’ views on whether using ChatGPT is acceptable depend on what it’s being used for. Among teens who have heard of ChatGPT: 69% say it’s acceptable to use it to research new topics. 39% say it’s acceptable to use it to solve math problems. 20% say it’s acceptable to use it to write essays. Shares ranging from 18% to 24% aren’t sure whether it is acceptable to use ChatGPT in each of these situations. **Overall, two-thirds of U.S. teens say they have heard of ChatGPT**. That includes 23% who have heard a lot about it and 44% who have heard a little about it. Roughly a third (32%) say they have heard nothing at all about ChatGPT.

**Because AI is a wolf in sheep’s clothing, we negate.**

**Our sole argument is undermining education.**

**Ai harms education in 3 key ways**

**The first is by spreading disinformation.**

**Generative AI only spits out what it finds on the internet.**

Rosalsky 24 --- (Greg Rosalsky, 8-5-2024, [*Reporter, Planet Money Since 2018, Greg Rosalsky has been a writer and reporter at NPR's Planet Money. Before joining NPR, he spent more than five years at Freakonomics Radio, where he produced 60 episodes that were downloaded nearly 100 million times. Those included an exposé of the damage filmmaking subsidies have on American visual-effects workers, a deep dive into the successes and failures of Germany's manufacturing model, and a primer on behavioral economics, which he wrote as a satire of traditional economic thought. Among the show's most popular episodes were those he produced about personal finance, including one on why it's a bad idea for people to pick and choose stocks. Rosalsky has written freelance articles for a number of publications, including The Behavioral Scientist and Pacific Standard. An article he authored about food inequality in New York City was anthologized in Best Food Writing 2017. Rosalsky began his career in the plains of Iowa working for an underdog presidential candidate named Barack Obama and was a White House researcher during the early years of the Obama Administration. He earned a master's degree at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, where he studied economics and public policy.*], "10 reasons why AI may be overrated", https://www.npr.org/sections/planet-money/2024/08/06/g-s1-15245/10-reasons-why-ai-may-be-overrated-artificial-intelligence) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

Is artificial intelligence overrated? Ever since ChatGPTheralded the explosion of generative AI in late 2022, the technology has seen incredible hype in the industry and media. And countless **investors** have **poured** billions and **billions** of dollars into it and related companies. But a growing chorus of naysayers is expressing doubts about how game-changing generative AI will actually be for the economy. The discord over AI recently inspired a two-part series on our daily podcast, The Indicator from Planet Money. Co-host Darian Woods and I decided to debate the question: Is AI overrated or underrated? Because there is quite a bit of uncertainty over how much AI will ultimately affect the economy — and because neither of us really wanted to regret making dumb prognostications — we chose to obscure our personal opinions on the matter. We flipped an AI-generated coin to determine which side of this debate each of us would take. I got "**AI is overrated**." I spoke to Massachusetts Institute of Technology economist Daron Acemoglu, who has emerged as one of AI's leading skeptics. I asked Acemoglu whether he thought generative AI would usher in revolutionary changes to the economy within the next decade. "No. No. Definitely not," Acemoglu said. "I mean, unless you count a lot of companies over-investing in generative AI and then regretting it, a revolutionary change." Ouch. That implies we've seen a massive financial bubble inflate before our very eyes (note that this interview was conducted before the recent stock market plunge, which may or may not have something do with expectations about AI). So why might AI be overrated? To make my polemical case, I ended up assembling a pretty long list of reasons. We couldn't fit it all in a short episode. So we decided to provide here a fuller list of reasons that AI may be overrated (complete with strongly worded arguments). Here you go: Reason 1: **The artificial intelligence we have now isn't actually** that **intelligent**. When you first use something like ChatGPT, it might seem like magic. Like, "Wow, a real thinking machine able to answer questions about anything." But when you look behind the curtains, it's more like a magic trick. Thes**e chatbots are a fancy way of aggregating the internet and then spitting out a mishmash of what they find**. Put simply, **they're** copycats or, at least, fundamentally dependent on mimicking past human work and **not capable of generating great new ideas**. And perhaps the worst part is that much of the stuff that **AI is copying** is copyrighted. AI companies took people's work and fed it into their machines, often without authorization. You could argue it's like systematic plagiarism.

**However, there is a vast amount of misinformation on the internet.**

Derby 24 --- (University of Derby, xx-xx-2024, "True or False? How much is fake news influencing our lives?", https://www.derby.ac.uk/magazine/issue-12/influence-of-fake-news/) //doa2-27-2025 + master chen 💆

Is it real or fake? Around **45% of adults** in the UK **believe they encounter fake news every day.** With a decrease in adults accessing news updates through their TVs and the use of social media for news on the rise, according to an Ofcom study, fake news has gathered momentum over the years. But what influence has fake news already had on the general public and what risk does it pose? In this section Formed of inaccurate information and often deliberately published or shared in media outlets and social media, fake news can be a dangerous way of obtaining information. When sharing news, people often don’t stop and think about whether the article could be fake and, in an age of instant internet access and social media platforms, news is shared to millions at the touch of a button. And

**Generative AI lacks the ability to screen through the misinformation, meaning it ultimately spits out the wrong content to students.**

Rosalsky 24 --- (Greg Rosalsky, 8-5-2024, [*Reporter, Planet Money Since 2018, Greg Rosalsky has been a writer and reporter at NPR's Planet Money. Before joining NPR, he spent more than five years at Freakonomics Radio, where he produced 60 episodes that were downloaded nearly 100 million times. Those included an exposé of the damage filmmaking subsidies have on American visual-effects workers, a deep dive into the successes and failures of Germany's manufacturing model, and a primer on behavioral economics, which he wrote as a satire of traditional economic thought. Among the show's most popular episodes were those he produced about personal finance, including one on why it's a bad idea for people to pick and choose stocks. Rosalsky has written freelance articles for a number of publications, including The Behavioral Scientist and Pacific Standard. An article he authored about food inequality in New York City was anthologized in Best Food Writing 2017. Rosalsky began his career in the plains of Iowa working for an underdog presidential candidate named Barack Obama and was a White House researcher during the early years of the Obama Administration. He earned a master's degree at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, where he studied economics and public policy.*], "10 reasons why AI may be overrated", https://www.npr.org/sections/planet-money/2024/08/06/g-s1-15245/10-reasons-why-ai-may-be-overrated-artificial-intelligence) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

Reason 2: **AI lies**. The AI industry and the media have come to call AI-generated falsehoods and errors "hallucinations." But like the term "artificial intelligence," that might be a misnomer. Because that makes it sound like it, you know, works well almost always — and then every once in a while, it likes to drink some ayahuasca or eat some mushrooms, and then it says some trippy, made-up stuff. But AI hallucinations seem to be more common than that (and, to be fair, a growing number of folks have begun calling them "confabulations"). One study suggests that **AI chatbots hallucinate** — or confabulate — somewhere **between 3% and 27% of the time**. Whoa, looks like AI should lay off the ayahuasca. AI hallucinations have been creating embarrassments for companies. For example, Google recently had to revamp its "AI Overviews" feature after it started **making ridiculous errors,** like telling users that they should put glue in pizza sauce and that it was healthy to eat rocks. Why did it recommend that people eat rocks? Probably because it **had** an article from the **satirical website** The Onion in its training **data**. Because these systems aren't actually intelligent, that tripped it up. Hallucinations make these systems unreliable. The industry is taking this seriously and working to reduce errors. There may be some progress on that front. But — because these **models don't know true from false and just mindlessly spit out words based on patterns in data** — many AI researchers and technologists

**Companies lie about their efficacy**

Rosalsky 24 --- (Greg Rosalsky, 8-5-2024, [*Reporter, Planet Money Since 2018, Greg Rosalsky has been a writer and reporter at NPR's Planet Money. Before joining NPR, he spent more than five years at Freakonomics Radio, where he produced 60 episodes that were downloaded nearly 100 million times. Those included an exposé of the damage filmmaking subsidies have on American visual-effects workers, a deep dive into the successes and failures of Germany's manufacturing model, and a primer on behavioral economics, which he wrote as a satire of traditional economic thought. Among the show's most popular episodes were those he produced about personal finance, including one on why it's a bad idea for people to pick and choose stocks. Rosalsky has written freelance articles for a number of publications, including The Behavioral Scientist and Pacific Standard. An article he authored about food inequality in New York City was anthologized in Best Food Writing 2017. Rosalsky began his career in the plains of Iowa working for an underdog presidential candidate named Barack Obama and was a White House researcher during the early years of the Obama Administration. He earned a master's degree at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, where he studied economics and public policy.*], "10 reasons why AI may be overrated", https://www.npr.org/sections/planet-money/2024/08/06/g-s1-15245/10-reasons-why-ai-may-be-overrated-artificial-intelligence) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

Sure, translators are increasingly using AI as a tool at their jobs. But my reporting revealed that AI is just not smart enough, not socially aware enough and not reliable enough to replace humans most of the time. And this seems to be true for a whole host of other jobs. For example, drive-through attendants. For close to three years, McDonald's piloted a program to use AI at some of its drive-throughs. It became a bit of an embarrassment. A bunch of viral videos showed AI making bizarre errors: like trying to add $222 worth of chicken nuggets to someone's order and adding bacon to someone's ice cream. I like how New York Times journalist Julia Angwin put it. Generative AI, she says, "could end up like the Roomba, the mediocre vacuum robot that does a passable job when you are home alone but not if you are expecting guests. Companies that can get by with Roomba-quality work will, of course, still try to replace workers. But in workplaces where quality matters … A.I. may not make significant inroads." Reason 4: AI's capabilities have been exaggerated. You may remember news stories from last year proclaiming that AI did really well on the Uniform Bar Exam for lawyers. **OpenAI**, the company behind ChatGPT, **claimed that GPT-4 scored in the 90th percentile. But while at MIT, researcher Eric Martinez dug deeper. He found that it scored only in the 48th percentile.** Is that actually impressive when these systems, with their ample training data, have the equivalent of a Google search at their fingertips? Heck, maybe even I could score that well if I had access to previous bar exams and other ways to cheat.

**The Second is academic integrity**

**Students use AI to cheat**

Westfall 23 --- (Chris Westfall, [writer @ Forbes], 1-28-2023, "Educators Battle Plagiarism As 89% Of Students Admit To Using OpenAI’s ChatGPT For Homework", https://www.forbes.com/sites/chriswestfall/2023/01/28/educators-battle-plagiarism-as-89-of-students-admit-to-using-open-ais-chatgpt-for-homework/) //doa2-21-2025 + master chen 💆

A large majority of students are already using ChatGPT for homework assignments, creating challenges around plagiarism, cheating, and learning. According to Wharton MBA Professor Christian Terwisch, ChatGPT would receive “a B or a B-” on an Ivy League MBA-level exam in operations management. Another professor at a Utah-based university asked ChatGPT to tweet in his voice - leading Professor Alex Lawrence to declare that “this is the greatest cheating tool ever invented”, according to the Wall Street Journal. **The plagiarism potential is potent - so, is banning the tool a realistic solution?** New research from Study.com provides eye-opening insight into the educational impact of ChatGPT, an online tool that has a surprising mastery of learning and human language. INSIDER reports that researchers recently put ChatGPT through the United States Medical Licensing exam (the three-part exam used to qualify medical school students for residency - basically, a test to see if you can be a doctor). In a December report, ChatGPT “performed at or near the passing threshold for all three exams without any training or reinforcement.” Lawrence, a professor from Weber State in Utah who tested via tweet, wrote a follow-up message to his students regarding the new platform from **OpenAI:** “I hope to inspire and educate you enough that you will want to learn how to leverage these tools, not just to learn t**o cheat better.**” No word on how the students have responded so far. Machines, tools and software have been making certain tasks easier for us for thousands of years. Are we about to outsource learning and education to artificial intelligence? And what are the implications, beyond the classroom, if we do? PROMOTED Considering that 90% of students are aware of ChatGPT, and **89%** of survey respondents report that they **have used the platform to help with a homework assignment,** the application of OpenAI’s platform is already here. More from the survey: 48% of students admitted to using ChatGPT for an at-home test or quiz, **53% had it write an essay,** and 22% had it write an outline for a paper. **72% of college students believe that ChatGPT should be banned from their college's network.** (New York, Seattle and Los Angeles have all blocked the service from their public school networks). 82% of college professors are aware of ChatGPT 72% of college professors who are aware of ChatGPT are concerned about its impact on cheating Over a third (34%) of all educators believe that ChatGPT should be banned in schools and universities, while 66% support students having access to it. Meanwhile, 5% of educators say that they have used ChatGPT to teach a class, and 7% have used the platform to create writing prompts. MORE FROM FORBES ADVISOR Graphic Best High-Yield Savings Accounts Of 2024 Best High-Yield Savings Accounts Of 2024 By Kevin Payne, Contributor Graphic Best 5% Interest Savings Accounts of 2024 Best 5% Interest Savings Accounts of 2024 By Cassidy Horton, Contributor A teacher quoted anonymously in the Study.com survey shares, “'I love that students would have another resource to help answer questions. Do I worry some kids would abuse it? Yes. But they use Google and get answers without an explanation. It's my understanding that ChatGPT explains answers. That [explanation] would be more beneficial.” Or would it become a crutch? CEO: C-suite news, analysis, and advice for top decision makers right to your inbox. Email address Sign Up By signing up, you agree to our Terms of Service, and you acknowledge our Privacy Statement. Forbes is protected by reCAPTCHA, and the Google Privacy Policy and Terms of Service apply. Modern society has many options for transportation: cars, planes, trains, and even electric scooters all help us to get around. But these machines haven’t replaced the simple fact that walking and running (on your own) is really, really good for you. Electric bikes are fun, but pushing pedals on our own is where we find our fitness. Without movement comes malady. A sedentary life that relies solely on external mechanisms for transport is a recipe for atrophy, poor health, and even a shortened lifespan. Will ChatGPT create educational atrophy, the equivalent of an electric bicycle for our brains? Of course, when calculators came into the classroom, many declared the decline of math skills would soon follow. Research conducted as recently as 2012 has proven this to be false. Calculators had no positive or negative effects on basic math skills. But ChatGPT has already gone beyond the basics, passing medical exams and MBA-level tests. A brave new world is already here, with implications for cheating and plagiarism, to be sure. But an even deeper implication points to the very nature of learning itself, when ChatGPT has become a super-charged repository for what is perhaps the most human of all inventions: the synthesis of our language. (That same synthesis that sits atop Blooms Taxonomy - a revered pyramid of thinking, that outlines the path to higher learning). Perhaps educators, students and even business leaders will discover something old is new again, from ChatGPT. That discovery? Seems Socrates was right: the key to strong education begins with asking the right questions. Especially if you are talking to a ‘bot.

**And detectors don’t work**

Wood 24 --- (Colin Wood, 9-9-2024, "AI detectors are easily fooled, researchers find", https://edscoop.com/ai-detectors-are-easily-fooled-researchers-find/) //doa2-28-2025 + master chen 💆

**detectors are easily fooled with simple tricks** and that many open-source models for detecting AI content use “dangerously high” default false positive rates. One of the study’s authors, Chris Callison-Burch, told EdScoop that one upshot of his research is that professors should think twice before accusing students of unethical behavior. But the findings are also more widely pertinent for a society that swims in an increasingly polluted sea of information. As totalitarian nations use generative AI tools to aid their propaganda campaigns and as bad actors use them to make their phishing emails and election misinformation sound more convincing, the value of a tool that can accurately validate human-generated content grows. Callison-Burch, who teaches UPenn’s popular AI course — he said it attracted 600 students last fall and that he expects this fall to be the same — said some of the AI-detection companies’ claims don’t match his research findings. Advertisement GPTZero advertises itself as producing the “most precise, reliable AI detection results on the market.” ZeroGPT bills itself as “the most Advanced and Reliable.” And Winston AI claims “unmatched accuracy” with a “**99.98% accuracy rate.”** While researchers found that most private companies studied had calibrated their models with sensible false-positive rates, the same wasn’t true for many tools that use open-source models. Callison-Burch said thetrouble with accuracy rates is that they often neglect false positives: **Anyone** can catch **100**% of AI-generated content if they’re willing **also to flag all or most human-generated content as being AI-generated,** for instance. He and his team found that adjusting models’ false-positive rates to what he called a “reasonable” level greatly reduced the ability of the models to detect AI-generated content. “**These claims of accuracy are not particularly relevant by themselves,**” he said. “… I would use these systems very judiciously if you’re a professor who wants to forbid AI writing in your classrooms. Probably don’t fail a student for using AI just based on evidence of these systems, but maybe use it as a conversation starter.” Another finding was that some of the most accurate detectors sometimes fail outright when faced with technical challenges that wouldn’t bother human evaluators. Researchers tested detectors against a series of “adversarial attacks,” such as adding whitespace to the text, introducing misspellings, selectively paraphrasing, removing grammatical articles and using homoglyphs, characters that look the same or very similar to ordinary letters or numbers, but that computers register as distinct. Advertisement **“That breaks these AI detectors and their performance drops by like 30%**,” Callison-Burch said of homoglyph attacks. “So if you’re a student and you want to get away with cheating, just add a bunch of homoglyphs and the teacher reading the essay is going to think it looks fine.” Researchers also found that AI detectors usually struggle to generalize across different AI models. Callison-Burch said that most detectors are good at identifying content created by ChatGPT, but that feeding them content generated by any number of lesser-known large language models can crush detector performance. Callison-Burch’s work isn’t only academic. He said he hopes this work will help open-source projects and private companies develop more-effective tools. His team published the dataset it used to test AI detectors — containing 10 million AI-generated texts — to be used as a standardized benchmarking corpus. Results are published on a public leaderboard, which is currently topped by a project called It’s AI. “Perhaps this can make the claims that people are making more scientific,” he said. Since the public release of ChatGPT in November 2022, many university students have claimed they’ve been falsely accused of cheating with generative AI — so many that The Washington Post last year published an article with tips on how students could defend themselves. It encouraged students to point out that essays on technical topics are more likely to be flagged as AI-generated because there’s less room for creativity when describing facts about engineering or biology, for instance. It also urged students to point to high-profile failures of AI detectors, such as GPTZero’s assessment that the U.S. Constitution was written by AI. Advertisement Although cheating is top of mind for many faculty and administrators in higher education, it’s only one mischievous use of generative AI. Callison-Burch, who’s been studying AI and natural language processing for more than two decades, said generative AI has exceeded the capabilities of what he thought he’d see in his lifetime, and that its influence is being exerted everywhere online, from e-commerce sites to scientific communities, where it can aid fraud. **“In some ways it’s a bit of an arms race,**” he said. “**People who want to cheat are going to come up with some clever new way of hiding their ChatGPT-generated text** and the detector companies are going to have to continuously improve their systems to buffer against those.”

**The third way is undermining academic rigor**

**Grose 24** --- (Jessica Grose, [writer @ the NY times] 8-14-2024, "What Teachers Told Me About A.I. in School", https://www.nytimes.com/2024/08/14/opinion/ai-schools-teachers-students.html) //doa2-25-2025 + master chen 💆in the library

Leila Wheless, a North Carolina teacher who has been an educator since 1991, tried to keep “an open heart” about using artificial intelligence in her middle school English and language arts classroom. She reviewed the guidance of her state’s generative A.I. “recommendations and considerations” for public schools. But the results of her students’ A.I. use were dispiriting. “For one particular assignment related to the novel ‘Persepolis,’ I had students research prophets,” Wheless explained, because the main character fantasizes about being a prophet. But, she told me via email, internet searches that incorporated A.I.: Gave students jewels such as “the Christian prophet Moses got chocolate stains out of T-shirts” — I guess rather than Moses got water out of a rock(?). And let me tell you, eighth graders wrote that down as their response. They did not come up to me and ask, “Is that correct? Moses is known for getting chocolate stains out of T-shirts?” They simply do not have the background knowledge or indeed the **intellectual stamina** to question unlikely responses. After I wrote a series in the spring about tech use in K-12 classrooms, I asked teachers about their experiences with A.I. because its ubiquity is fairly new and educators are just starting to figure out how to grapple with it. I spoke with middle school, high school and college instructors, and my overall takeaway is that while there are a **few real benefits** to using A.I. in schools — it can be useful in speeding up rote tasks like adding citations to essays and doing basic coding — the **drawbacks are significant.** The biggest issue isn’t just that students might use it to cheat — students have been trying to cheat forever — or that they might wind up with absurdly wrong answers, like confusing Moses with Mr. Clean. The thornier problem is that when students **rely** on a **generative A.I**. tool like ChatGPT to **outsource brainstorming** and **writing**, they may be **losing the ability to think critically** and to overcome frustration with tasks that don’t come easily to them. Sarah Martin, who teaches high school English in California, wrote to me saying, “**Cheating** by copying from A.I. is **rampant**, particularly among my disaffected seniors who are just waiting until graduation.” Advertisement SKIP ADVERTISEMENT When I followed up with her over the phone, she said that it’s getting more and more difficult to catch A.I. use because a savvier user will recognize absurdities and hallucinations and go back over what a chatbot spits out to make it read more as if the user wrote it herself. But what troubles Martin more than some students’ shrewd academic dishonesty is “that there’s just no grit that’s instilled in them. There’s no sense of ‘Yes, you’re going to struggle, but you’re going to feel good at the end of it.’” She said that the amount of time her students are inclined to work on something that challenges them has become much shorter over the seven years she’s been teaching. There was a time, she said, when **a typical student would wrestle with a concept for days before getting it. But now, if that student doesn’t understand something within minutes, he’s more likely to give up on his own brain power and look for an alternative**, whether it’s a chatbot or asking a friend for help. Students aren’t giving up because they’re lazy, Martin said, but because they’re quick to assume they’re not smart if they can’t grasp certain concepts right away; it’s almost as if the speed of available technology is making them assume that their human brains should have all the answers. They worry that their friends **will make fun of them** for not catching on fast enough. “It’s avoiding the peer judgment that they anticipate, whether it’s real or not,” she said. These teenagers think: “My friends are going to see I don’t get it. They’re going to think I’m stupid.” Many instructors have wised up to student use of A.I. and have already changed their methods of instruction, in some cases relying less on assignments that are completed outside of the classroom, or updating their coursework to make cheating more difficult. Several English teachers told me that there are fewer accurate plot summaries about newer books, so it’s harder to get generative A.I. to write a good essay about a book written in 2023 than about “The Catcher in the Rye.”

Carrillo 23 --- (Sequoia Carrillo, 6-20-2023, "U.S. reading and math scores drop to lowest level in decades", https://www.npr.org/2023/06/21/1183445544/u-s-reading-and-math-scores-drop-to-lowest-level-in-decades) //doa3-28-2025 + master chen 💆

The **average test scores** for U.S. 13-year-olds have dipped in reading and dropped **sharply** in math since 2020, according to new data from National Assessment of Educational Progress.

The average scores, from tests given last fall, declined 4 points in reading and 9 points in math, compared with tests given in the 2019-2020 school year, and are the **lowest in decades.** The declines in reading were more pronounced for lower performing students, but dropped across all percentiles.

The **math scores were even more disappointing.** On a scale of 500 points, the declines ranged from 6 to 8 points for middle and high performing students, to 12 to 14 points for low performing students.

The math results also showed widening gaps based on gender and race. Scores decreased by 11 points for female students over 2020 results, compared with a 7-point decrease for male students.

Among Black students, math scores declined 13 points, while white students had a 6-point drop. Compared with the 35-point gap between Black and white students in 2020, the disparity widened to 42 points.

**Thus,**

Grose 24 --- (Jessica Grose, [writer @ the NY times] 8-14-2024, "What Teachers Told Me About A.I. in School", https://www.nytimes.com/2024/08/14/opinion/ai-schools-teachers-students.html) //doa2-25-2025 + master chen 💆in the library

Leila Wheless, a North Carolina teacher who has been an educator since 1991, tried to keep “an open heart” about using artificial intelligence in her middle school English and language arts classroom. She reviewed the guidance of her state’s generative A.I. “recommendations and considerations” for public schools. But the results of her students’ A.I. use were dispiriting. “For one particular assignment related to the novel ‘Persepolis,’ I had students research prophets,” Wheless explained, because the main character fantasizes about being a prophet. But, she told me via email, internet searches that incorporated A.I.: Gave students jewels such as “the Christian prophet Moses got chocolate stains out of T-shirts” — I guess rather than Moses got water out of a rock(?). And let me tell you, eighth graders wrote that down as their response. They did not come up to me and ask, “Is that correct? Moses is known for getting chocolate stains out of T-shirts?” They simply do not have the background knowledge or indeed the **intellectual stamina** to question unlikely responses. After I wrote a series in the spring about tech use in K-12 classrooms, I asked teachers about their experiences with A.I. because its ubiquity is fairly new and educators are just starting to figure out how to grapple with it. I spoke with middle school, high school and college instructors, and my overall takeaway is that while there are a **few real benefits** to using A.I. in schools — it can be useful in speeding up rote tasks like adding citations to essays and doing basic coding — the **drawbacks are significant.** The biggest issue isn’t just that students might use it to cheat — students have been trying to cheat forever — or that they might wind up with absurdly wrong answers, like confusing Moses with Mr. Clean. The thornier problem is that when **students rely on a generative A.I. tool like ChatGPT to outsource brainstorming and writing, they may be losing the ability to think critically and to overcome frustration with tasks that don’t come easily to them**. Sarah Martin, who teaches high school English in California, wrote to me saying, “**Cheating** by copying from A.I. is **rampant**, particularly among my disaffected seniors who are just waiting until graduation.” Advertisement SKIP ADVERTISEMENT When I followed up with her over the phone, she said that it’s getting more and more difficult to catch A.I. use because a savvier user will recognize absurdities and hallucinations and go back over what a chatbot spits out to make it read more as if the user wrote it herself. But what troubles Martin more than some students’ shrewd academic dishonesty is “that there’s just no grit that’s instilled in them. There’s no sense of ‘Yes, you’re going to struggle, but you’re going to feel good at the end of it.’” She said that the amount of time her students are inclined to work on something that challenges them has become much shorter over the seven years she’s been teaching. There was a time, she said, when a typical student would wrestle with a concept for days before getting it. But now, if that student doesn’t understand something within minutes, he’s more likely to give up on his own brain power and look for an alternative, whether it’s a chatbot or asking a friend for help. Students aren’t giving up because they’re lazy, Martin said, but because they’re quick to assume they’re not smart if they can’t grasp certain concepts right away; it’s almost as if the speed of available technology is making them assume that their human brains should have all the answers. They worry that their friends **will make fun of them** for not catching on fast enough. “It’s avoiding the peer judgment that they anticipate, whether it’s real or not,” she said. These teenagers think: “My friends are going to see I don’t get it. They’re going to think I’m stupid.” Many instructors have wised up to student use of A.I. and have already changed their methods of instruction, in some cases relying less on assignments that are completed outside of the classroom, or updating their coursework to make cheating more difficult. Several English teachers told me that there are fewer accurate plot summaries about newer books, so it’s harder to get generative A.I. to write a good essay about a book written in 2023 than about “The Catcher in the Rye.”

**For example,**

Goteka 24--- (Panashe Goteka, [*EdTech Advocate and Enthusiast with a Penchant for Community Building*], xx-xx-2024, "Negative Effects of Artificial Intelligence in Education", https://www.mobileguardian.com/blog/negative-effects-of-artificial-intelligence-in-education) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

AI algorithms can **perpetuate** existing **biases** present in the data they’re trained on. This can lead to unequal learning experiences, to the detriment of students from certain backgrounds. Without a discerning approach to this matter, AI tools may continue to propagate these tendencies. A great example is an AI called “Bookworm AI” designed to personalise reading recommendations for students. This AI analyses a student’s reading history, preferences, and grade level to suggest books they might enjoy. However, it has been observed that if the training data primarily consists of books by Western authors, the AI might overlook fantastic works by Asian authors, for example. This could hinder students from diverse backgrounds from encountering a well-rounded selection of literature. For instance, a student interested in historical fiction might be suggested: “The Book Thief” (German setting) or “All the Light We Cannot See” (French setting), but not “Pachinko” (Korean-Japanese diaspora) or “The Kite Runner” (Afghanistan). This bias not only limits exposure to diverse literary traditions but also reinforces the idea that “great literature” primarily comes from the West, marginalising the contributions of Asian and other non-Western authors. Dehumanisation of Learning Reliance on AI tutors could **diminish** the vital **role** of human teachers **in fostering critical thinking,** social interaction, and emotional development which are all hugely crucial aspects of education. Student with AI tutor, EssayGrader logo vs. student engaged with a teacher. While AI like DreamBox Learning can provide personalised feedback on Maths problems, it can’t offer the same level of encouragement, guidance, and real-time course correction as a human teacher can. In science experiments, for example, a teacher’s presence is essential to ensure student safety, answer questions, and guide them towards deeper understanding through discussions. The **human touch is an exceptionally important aspect of learning,** and **ensuring that students aren’t relegated to cold, isolated learning environments is an important balanc**e and consideration for educations the world over. Privacy and Security Threats Student data security is paramount, especially in digital learning environments, where data is online and relies on safety standards of multiple parties and suppliers of software from around the world. Regional data protection regulations can differ, and ensuring the right standards are adhered to is crucial when assessing options. AI systems that collect and analyse student data raise privacy concerns, and the AI industry at large are consistently battling perceptions of control of AI and whether they access information they should not. Locked device icon with question mark. Schools need to be transparent about the data collected by AI-powered learning platforms and ensure it’s stored securely in accordance with regional regulations. This is particularly important in countries with stricter data privacy laws, such as the European Union and South Korea. **Tech Dependence** and **Reduce**d **Critical Thinking** Overdependence on AI for problem-solving can **hinder students’ ability** to develop critical thinking skills and **develop independent learning skills**. An AI homework helper might churn out solutions to complex math problems in seconds. However, this deprives students of the opportunity to grapple with the problem themselves, develop logical reasoning skills, and experience the satisfaction of arriving at a solution independently. Student on a tablet working on early algebra structure. For instance, **Photomath allows users to take a picture of a Maths problem, and it will provide a step-by-step solution**. While this can be helpful for checking answers or understanding difficult concepts, it can also **hinder the learning process by preventing students from developing problem-solving skills an**d critical thinking abilities. Though access to an answer through such a tool would have revolutionised my educational experience, I think we can agree that its only after grappling with the problem at hand, and then working through the solution step-by-step that we internalise and learn from the work. Job Displacement AI automation might impact educators’ roles, particularly in areas like grading and individualised learning plans. While AI can automate tasks like grading multiple-choice quizzes, it **can’t replicate** the nuanced **feedback** a human teacher can provide on essays or projects. EssayGrader, for instance, is an AI-powered tool that can assess essays and provide scores, but it falls short of offering the in-depth, personalised feedback that a teacher can give to encourage student growth. Teachers will still be essential for guiding students, providing constructive criticism, and cultivating a love of learning

**Best studies proves Ai decrease academic performance**

Abbas24 --- (Muhammad Abbas, [*FAST School of Management, National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences, Islamabad, Pakistan*], 2-15-2024, "Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the causes and consequences of generative AI usage among university students", https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-024-00444-7) //doa2-24-2025 + master chen 💆

The structural model is presented in Fig. 3. Fig. 3 figure 3 Structural model (Study 2) Full size image As presented in Table 5, the findings revealed that workload was positively related to the use of ChatGPT (β = 0.133, t = 2.622, p < 0.01). Thos**e students who experienced high levels of academic workload were more likely to engage in ChatGPT usage. T**his result supported hypothesis 1. Similarly, **time pressure** also had a significantly **positive** relationship with the **use** of ChatGPT (β = 0.163, t = 3.226, p < 0.001), thereby supporting hypothesis 2. In other words, students who experienced high time pressure to accomplish their academic tasks also reported higher use of ChatGPT. Further, the effect of sensitivity to rewards on the use of ChatGPT was negative and marginally significant (β = − 0.102, t = 1.710, p < 0.10), thereby suggesting that students who are more sensitive to rewards are less likely to use ChatGPT. These results supported hypothesis 3b instead of hypothesis 3a. Finally, we found that sensitivity to quality was not significantly related to the use of ChatGPT (β = 0.033, t = 0.590, n.s). Thus, hypothesis 4 was not supported. Table 5 Direct effects (Study 2) Full size table Consistent with hypothesis 5, the findings further revealed that the use of ChatGPT was positively related to procrastination (β = 0.309, t = 6.984, p < 0.001). Those students who frequently used ChatGPT were more likely to engage in procrastination than those who rarely used ChatGPT. Use of ChatGPT was also found to be positively related to memory loss (β = 0.274, t = 6.452, p < 0.001), thus hypothesis 6 was also supported. Students who frequently used ChatGPT also reported memory impairment. Furthermore, **use** of ChatGPT was found to have a **negative effect** on academic **performance** (i.e., CGPA) of the students (β = − 0.104, t = 2.390, p < 0.05). **Students who frequently used ChatGPT for their academic tasks had poor CGPAs**. These findings rendered support for hypothesis 7. Table 6 presents the results for all indirect effects. As shown in Table 6, workload had a positive indirect effect on procrastination (indirect effect = 0.041, t = 2.384, p < 0.05) and memory loss (indirect effect = 0.036, t = 2.333, p < 0.05) through the use of ChatGPT. Students who experienced higher workload were more likely to use ChatGPT which in turn developed the habits of procrastination among them and caused memory loss. Similarly, workload had a negative indirect effect on academic performance (indirect effect = − 0.014, t = 1.657, p < 0.10) through the use of ChatGPT. In other words, students who experienced higher workload were more likely to use ChatGPT. As a result, the extensive use of ChatGPT dampened their academic performance. These results supported hypothesis 8. Table 6 Indirect effects via use of ChatGPT (Study 2) Full size table In addition, time pressure had a positive indirect effect on both **procrastination** (indirect effect = 0.050, t = 2.607, p < 0.01) and **memory loss** (indirect effect = 0.045, t = 2.574, p < 0.01), **through an increased utilization of ChatGPT. S**tudents facing higher time constraints were more inclined to use ChatGPT, ultimately fostering procrastination habits and experiencing memory issues. Similarly, time pressure had a negative indirect effect on academic performance (indirect effect = − 0.017, t = 1.680, p < 0.10), mediated by the increased use of ChatGPT. Thus, students experiencing greater time pressure were more likely to rely heavily on ChatGPT, consequently leading to a dampening of their academic performance. Together, these results supported hypothesis 9. Furthermore, sensitivity to rewards had a negative indirect relationship with procrastination (indirect effect = − 0.032, 1.676, p < 0.10) and memory loss (indirect effect = − 0.028, t = 1.668, p < 0.10) through the use of ChatGPT. Students who were sensitive to rewards were less likely to use ChatGPT and thus experience lower levels of procrastination and memory loss. However, the findings revealed that the indirect effect of sensitivity to rewards on academic performance was insignificant (indirect effect = 0.011, t = 1.380, p = 0.168). These findings supported hypothesis 10 for procrastination and memory loss only. Finally, the indirect effects of sensitivity to quality on procrastination (indirect effect = 0.010, t = 0.582, n.s), memory loss (indirect effect = 0.009, t = 0.582, n.s), and academic performance (indirect effect = − 0.003, t = 0.535, n.s) through the use of ChatGPT were all insignificant. Therefore, hypothesis 11 was not supported. Overall discussion Major findings The recent emergence of generative AI has brought about significant implications for various societal institutions, including higher education institutions. As a result, there has been a notable upswing in discussions among scholars and academicians regarding the transformative potential of generative AI, particularly ChatGPT, in higher education and the risks associated with it (Dalalah & Dalalah, 2023; Meyer et al., 2023; Peters et al., 2023; Yilmaz & Yilmaz, 2023a). Specifically, the dynamics of ChatGPT are still unknown in the context that no study, to date, has yet provided any empirical evidence on why students’ use ChatGPT. The literature is also silent on the potential consequences, harmful or beneficial, of ChatGPT usage (Dalalah & Dalalah, 2023; Paul et al., 2023) despite a ban in many institutions across the globe. Responding to these gaps in the literature, the current study proposed workload, time pressure, sensitivity to rewards, and sensitivity to quality as the potential determinants of the use of ChatGPT. In addition, the study examined the effects of ChatGPT usage on students’ procrastination, memory loss, and academic performance. The findings suggested that those students who experienced high levels of academic workload and time pressure to accomplish their tasks reported higher use of ChatGPT. Regarding the competing hypotheses on the effects of sensitivity to rewards on ChatGPT usage, the findings suggested that the students who were more sensitive to rewards were less likely to use ChatGPT. This indicates that rewards sensitive students might avoid the use ChatGPT for the fear of getting a poor grade if caught. Surprisingly, we found that sensitivity to quality was not significantly related to the use of ChatGPT. It appears that quality consciousness might not determine the use of ChatGPT because some quality conscious students might consider the tasks completed by personal effort as having high quality. In contrast, other quality conscious students might consider ChatGPT written work as having a better quality. Furthermore, our findings suggested that excessive use of ChatGPT can have harmful effects on students’ personal and academic outcomes. Specifically, those students who frequently used ChatGPT were more likely to engage in procrastination than those who rarely used ChatGPT. Similarly, students who frequently used ChatGPT also reported memory loss. In the same vein, students who frequently used ChatGPT for their academic tasks had a poor CGPA. The mediating effects indicated that academic workload and time pressure were likely to promote procrastination and memory impairment among students through the use of ChatGPT. Also, these stressors dampened students’ academic performance through the excessive use of ChatGPT. Consistently, the findings suggested that higher reward sensitivity discouraged the students to use ChatGPT for their academic tasks. The **less use** of ChatGPT, in turn, helped the students experience **lower levels of procrastination and memory loss.**

**Ai hurts decision making and increases laziness**

Ahmad 23 --- (Sayed Fayaz Ahmad, [*Institute of Business Management, Karachi, Pakistan*], 6-9-2023, "Impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education", https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-01787-8) //doa2-21-2025 + master chen 💆

Table 8 shows the total direct relationships in the model. The first direct relationship is between artificial intelligence to loss in human decision-making, with a beta value of 0.277. The beta value shows that **one unit increase in artificial intelligence will lose human decision-making by 0.277 units** among university students in Pakistan and China. This relationship having the t value of 5.040, greater than the threshold value of 1.96, and a p-value of 0.000, <0.05, shows that the relationship is statistically significant. The second relationship is between artificial intelligence the human laziness. The beta value for this relationship is 0.689, which shows that one unit increase in artificial intelligence will make the students of Pakistan and China universities lazy by 0.689 units. The t-value for the relationship is 23.257, which is greater than the threshold value of 1.96, and a p-value of 0.000, which is smaller than the threshold value of 0.05, which shows that this relationship is also statistically significant. The third and last relationship is from artificial intelligence to security and privacy issues of Pakistani and Chinese university students. The beta value for this relationship is 0.686, which shows that a one-unit increase in artificial intelligence will increase security and privacy issues by 0.686. The t-value for the relationship is 17.105, which is greater than the threshold value of 1.96, and the **p-value is 0.000,** which is smaller than a threshold value of 0.05, indicating that this **relationship is also statistically significant**. Table 8 Regression analysis. Full size table Hypothesis testing Table 8 also indicates that the results support all three hypotheses. Model fitness Once the reliability and validity of the measurement model are confirmed, the structural model fitness must be assessed in the next step. For the model fitness, several measures are available in the SmartPLS, like SRMR, Chi-square, NFI, etc., but most of the researcher recommends the SRMR for the model fitness in the PLS-SEM. When applying PLS-SEM, a value <0.08 is generally considered a good fit (Hu and Bentler, 1998). However, the table of model fitness shows that the SRMR value is 0.06, which is less than the threshold value of 0.08, which indicates that the model is fit. Predictive relevance of the model Table 9 shows the model’s prediction power, as we know that the model has total dependent variables. Then there are three predictive values for the model for each variable. The threshold value for predicting the model power is greater than zero. However, Q2 values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, respectively, indicate that an independent variable of the model has a low, moderate, or high predictive relevance for a certain endogenous construct (Hair et al., 2013). Human laziness has the highest predictive relevance, with a Q2 value of 0.338, which shows a moderate effect. Safety and security issues have the second largest predictive relevance with the Q2 value of 0.314, which also show a moderate effect. The last and smallest predictive relevance in decision-making with a Q2 value of 0.033 which shows a low effect. A greater Q2 value shows that the variable or model has the highest prediction power. Table 9 IPMA analysis. Full size table Importance performance matrix analysis (IPMA) Table 10 shows the importance and performance of each independent variable for the dependent variables. We see that artificial intelligence has the same performance of 68.78% for all three variables: human laziness, decision-making, safety, and security. While the importance of artificial intelligence, human laziness is 68.9%, loss in decision-making is 25.1%, and safety and security are 74.6%. This table shows that safety and privacy have the highest importance, and their performance is recommended to be increased to meet the important requirements. Figures 3–5 also show all three variables’ importance compared to performance with artificial intelligence. Table 10 Multi-group (analysis of gender)a. Full size table Fig. 3 figure 3 Importance-performance map—**human loss in decision making and artificial intelligence.** Full size image Fig. 4 figure 4 Importance-performance map—human laziness and artificial intelligence. Full size image Fig. 5 figure 5 Importance-performance map—safety and privacy and artificial intelligence. Full size image Multi-group analysis (MGA) Multigroup analysis is a technique in structural equation modeling that compares the effects of two classes of categorical variables on the model’s relationships. The first category is gender, composed of male and female subgroups or types. Table 10 shows the gender comparison for all three relationships. The data record shows that there were 164 males and 121 females. The p-values of all three relationships are >0.05, which shows that gender is not moderate in any of the relationships. Table 10 shows the country-wise comparison for all three relationships in the model. The p-values of all three relationships are >0.05, indicating no moderating effect of the country on all three relationships. The data records show 143 Pakistanis and 142 Chinese based on the country’s origin. Discussion AI is becoming an increasingly important element of our lives, with its impact felt in various aspects of our daily life. Like any other technological advancement, there are both benefits and challenges. This study examined the association of AI with human loss in decision-making, laziness and safety and privacy concerns. The results given Tables 11 and 12 show that AI has a **significant positive relationship** with all these variables. The findings of this study also support that the use of AI technologies is creating problems for users related to security and privacy. Previous research has also shown similar results (Bartoletti, 2019; Saura et al., 2022; Bartneck et al., 2021). Using AI technology in an educational organization also leads to security and privacy issues for students, teachers, and institutions. In today’s information age, security and privacy are critical concerns of AI technology use in educational organizations (Kamenskih, 2022). Skills specific to using AI technology are required for its effective use. Insufficient knowledge about the use will lead to security and privacy issues (Vazhayil and Shetty, 2019). Mostly, educational firms do not have AI technology experts in managing it, which again increases its **vulnerability** in the context of security and privacy issues. Even if its users have sound skills and the firms have experienced AI managers, no one can deny that any security or privacy control could be broken by mistake and could lead to serious security and privacy problems. Moreover, the fact that people with different levels of skills and competence interact in educational organizations also leads to the hacking or leaking of personal and institutional data (Kamenskih, 2022). AI is based on algorithms and uses large data sets to automate instruction (Araujo et al., 2020). Any mistake in the algorithms will create serious problems, and unlike humans, it will repeat the same mistake in making its own decisions. It also increases the threat to institutional and student data security and privacy. The same challenge is coming from the student end. They can be easily victimized as they are not excellently trained to use AI (Asaro, 2019). With the increase in the number of users, competence division and distance, safety and privacy concerns increase (Lv and Singh, 2020). The consequences depend upon the nature of the attack and the data been leaked or used by the attackers (Vassileva, 2008). The findings show that AI-based products and services are increasing the human laziness factor among those relying more on AI. However, there were not too many studies conducted on this factor by the researcher in the past, but the numerous researchers available in the literature also endorse the findings of this study (Farrow, 2022; Bartoletti, 2019). **AI in education leads to the creation of laziness in humans**.AI performs repetitive tasks in an automated manner and **does not let humans memorize, use analytical mind skills, or use cognition (**Nikita, 2023). It leads to an addiction behavior not to use human capabilities, thus making humans lazy. Teachers and students who use AI technology will slowly and gradually **lose interest** in doing tasks themselves. This is another important concern of AI in the education sector (Crispin Andrews). The teachers and students are getting lazy and losing their decision-making abilities as much of the work is assisted or replaced by AI technology (BARON, 2023). Posner and Fei-Fei (2020) suggested it is time to change AI for education. The findings also show that the access use of AI will gradually lead to the loss of human decision-making power. The results also endorsed the statement that AI is one of the major causes of the human loss of decision-making power. Several researchers from the past have also found that AI is a major cause responsible for the gradual loss of people’s decision-making (Pomerol, 1997; Duan et al., 2019; Cukurova et al., 2019). AI performs repetitive tasks in an automated manner and does not let humans memorize, use analytical mind skills, or use cognition, leading to the loss of decision-making capabilities (Nikita, 2023). An online environment for education can be a good option (VanLangen, 2021), but the classroom’s physical environment is the prioritized education mode (Dib and Adamo, 2014). In a real environment, there is a significant level of interaction between the teacher and students, which develop the character and civic bases of the students, e.g., students can learn from other students, ask teachers questions, and even feel the education environment. Along with the curriculum, they can learn and adopt many positive understandings (Quinlan et al., 2014). They can learn to use their cognitive power to choose options, etc. But unfortunately, the use of AI technology **minimizes** the **real-time physical interaction** (Mantello et al., 2021) and the education environment between students and teachers, which has a considerable **impact on students’ schooling**, character, civic responsibility, and their power to make decisions, i.e., use their cognition. AI technology reduces the cognitive power of humans who make their own decisions (Hassani and Unger, 2020).

**Which is why,**

**AI hurts test taking abilities**

Thornton 24 --- (Lasherica Thornton, 9-6-2024, "UPDATE: Students using artificial intelligence did worse on tests, experiment shows", https://edsource.org/updates/students-using-artificial-intelligence-did-worse-on-tests-experiment-shows) //doa2-21-2025 + master chen 💆

According to The Hechinger Report, students utilizing artificial intelligence programs did worse on math tests than their peers without access, an experiment in a Turkish high school found. University of Pennsylvania researchers compared the math progress of nearly 1,000 high schoolers by evaluating how they performed on practice math problems, then on tests. Some students had access to the AI program ChatGPT while doing the practice math problems; some had access to an AI tutor version of ChatGPT while practicing; and others practiced on their own. Students using ChatGPT solved 48% more of the problems correctly, and those with the AI tutor solved 127% more problems correctly, according to the report. But their peers who did not use ChatGPT outscored them on the related tests. In fact, **students using ChatGPT scored 17% worse on tests.** Kids working on their own performed the same on practice assignments and tests. Researchers told The Hechinger Report that students are using the chatbot as a “crutch” and that it can “substantially inhibit learning.

**Worse test performances correlate to lower wages.**

**Meckler 25** — (Laura Meckler [AB in polysci and intl dev @ WashU St. Louis; national edu writer for wash post], 2-25-2025, "Students aren’t recovering from covid. Test scores are getting worse.…", archive.is, https://archive.is/0BZoQ, accessed 2-26-2025) //FK

“I don’t know how many different ways you can say these results are bad, but they’re bad,” said **Dan Goldhaber, an education researcher at the American Institutes for Research and the University of Washington.** “I don’t think this is the canary in the coal mine. This is a flock of dead birds in the coal mine.” **Test scores are correlated with wages**, he said, so the drop in achievement has direct consequences for the economy that are hard to see now but will become clear over time. He said the **damage will** likely **amount to a loss of trillions of dollars in earnings over time.**

**Lower wages mean worse life outcomes.**

**Kezios 23**, Katrina [in dept. Of public health at Columbia University] L et al. “History of Low Hourly Wage and All-Cause Mortality Among Middle-aged Workers.” JAMA vol. 329,7 (2023): 561-573. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.0367

In a longitudinal study of 4002 workers with biennially reported hourly wage, a sustained history of **low-wage earning** in midlife was **associated with significantly earlier and excess mortality**, especially for workers whose low-wage earning was experienced in the context of employment instability.

**AND, lower wages also means less consumption, hurting the broader economy.**

**EWCD** — (Education & The Workforce Committee Democrats, no date, "Education & The Workforce Committee Democrats", No Publication, https://democrats-edworkforce.house.gov/download/fact-sheet-raising-the-minimum-wage-is-good-for-workers-business-and-the-economy-, accessed 2-26-2025) //FK

**Raising** the federal minimum **wage** will also stimulate consumer spending, help businesses’ bottom lines, and grow the economy. A modest increase would improve worker productivity, and reduce employee turnover and absenteeism. It would also **boost** the **overall economy by generating increased consumer demand.**

**A worse economy impacts millions.**

**Grunewald 06** — (Rob Grunewald [economist @ the fed reserve bank in minneapolis], 11-1-2006, "The connection between poverty and the economy", No Publication, https://www.minneapolisfed.org/article/2006/the-connection-between-poverty-and-the-economy, accessed 2-26-2025) //FK

It makes sense that poverty rates are related to the overall health of the economy. **As the economy grows, so do opportunities for employment and income growth. Stronger labor markets and higher income levels tend to help those families living in poverty move above the poverty threshold.**

Perkel 25 --- (Sarah Perkel;Sarah Perkel is an editorial fellow with Business Insider, on the trending news desk. She's previously written for the South Florida Business Journal and the Miami New Times. 3-26-2025, "College Students Say They Worry About Their AI Use", https://archive.is/7j08N) //doa3-28-2025 + master chen 💆in COMP SCI ahhh

BI talked to more than a dozen college students to see how they're using AI to manage their coursework.

Despite the ever-increasing prevalence and power of AI, some students said they were wary of using the tech.

Others reported heavy use and worried or over-reliance and **skill atrophy.**

College students are using AI to help them lighten their course loads — but the process isn't always guilt-free.

Business Insider talked with over a dozen students about their AI use for schoolwork, and the conversations revealed a range of feelings amid educators' complaints of a wave of AI plagiarism.

Whether they were light or heavy users, the students seemed to grapple with the tradeoffs of using the technology.

Many told BI they felt a level of discomfort or suspicion — and some said they tried to avoid using it altogether.

"Honestly, I try to avoid it as much as possible. I **don't** really **trust** it," said Ellis Edgeman, an accounting major at Florida State University. "Having to fact-check everything that AI puts out, and then also having to reword everything so that it doesn't detect AI. It just **seems like more work than just doing the assignment.**"

Fears of hallucination aside, other students are wary of over-reliance on AI and its potential for far-reaching consequences.

"It scares me to go all in because then I feel like my **skills** and my development, personally, professionally, will just kind of **stagnate**," said Michael, a computer science major at the University of Miami. "And once you kind of get stuck into that, it's hard to get out."

Michael, who requested to go by his first name to avoid potential academic consequences, said he grapples with feeling guilty about depending on a technology that could one day eliminate the possibility of a future career in programming.

Still, he said he like almost everyone he knows, relies on AI — it's just a question of how much.

"The longer the semester goes, the more burned out you get, the easier it is to fall into that trap," Michael said. "But I think almost everybody uses it to some extent."

Some students are using AI to streamline what they call 'busywork'

Of those who do lean on AI to help complete their schoolwork, many said they avoid allowing it to complete entire assignments for them, and instead use it to cut through "busywork."

Nicole Rivera-Reyes, a senior legal studies major at the University of Central Florida, said she avoids ChatGPT but relies heavily on Google's NotebookLM, particularly to help her transcribe videos and take notes.

"I think at the most, it should be used to streamline a task, not completely do it over," Rivera-Reyes said. "Instead of like — I understand the human element as far as error goes, right, but at most, I think it should be used to get through whatever busywork you have."

Samantha Wilson, a music education major at the University of Bridgeport in Connecticut, said she avoids AI altogether because she's "terrified" of getting flagged for plagiarism. For her peers who do dare, Wilson said it's just a matter of sorting out the work that they find valuable, or critical to the learning process.

"I've had classmates tell me that they use it for everything," Wilson said. "But I think that they're just utilizing the tool because they feel like the essay is a waste of their time. They already know the material, and they'd be fine not getting that experience of writing the paper."

Others are turning to AI to cope with what they describe as overwhelming course loads

A health sciences major and a musical theater student are both wrapping up their final years at the University of Miami. Both, who requested anonymity to avoid academic consequences, said they're relatively heavy AI users and cited similar reasons — heavy loads and teachers who moved faster than they felt they could keep up with.

Related stories

A popular plagiarism checker has pulled a big about-face on AI for students

Sam Altman says students should master AI tools the way his generation learned to code

"I had a teacher who was moving incredibly fast, and I barely even understood any of the concepts, and at that point, it was just like I needed to get a good grade," the musical theater student told BI. "AI broke down the concepts in a way that made it easier to understand for me than the actual teacher."

The theater student said the **process** felt **mercenary**, like she was "just **checking** a **box**," but that balancing her stacked schedule would become impossible without AI to clear quick tasks off her plate.

"I have my classes, on top of a show that I produce, on top of work hours, on top of potentially designing for another show," she said. "I do not have time. If I couldn't get through my homework quickly, I don't know what I would do. I already struggle enough to take care of myself in the busiest times."

The health sciences major, who said she used AI to get through a physics course in a similar fashion, said the tool is vital in freeing up her time — not just for social needs but for self-care.

"The time I get back by using AI, I honestly just use to shower and sleep. In sophomore year before I used any AI — it's so bad, but I used to have like zero food," she said. "Now I'm actually able to take care of basic human needs."

Students turning to AI to bail them out isn't unique to a single university. An architectural engineering student at Farmingdale State College in New York said he depended on it to save his grade in a challenging statics course.

The student, who requested **anonymity given** his use of **AI**, felt his entire class had fallen behind by the end of the semester. He said it prompted an incident of covert cheating — during a final conducted on university grounds, the student described a group effort to source and share answers to test questions.

"**None of us were retaining any information**," he added. "So, what we did was sort of like a group chat where half of us used Chegg and the other half used ChatGPT, and we shared answers for the test."

Some students fear the consequences of long-term reliance

Several students told BI that they worried that, for all its **time-saving** and **revision benefits,** using AI would come at a critical cost — **skill atrophy.**

Riley, a computer science major at the University of Florida who requested to go by his first name, said he's **already seeing** the effects of **long-term AI usage.**

"I will be the first one to tell you I've struggled with that before," Riley said. "With using AI for something and then going back to it, like, a month later, and being like, 'Oh, I don't remember what this does, or I don't remember how I did this.'"

A paper released by researchers at Microsoft and Carnegie Mellon University suggested that the more workers relied on AI to automate tedious tasks, the more **detached from** the **output** they became.

"Surprisingly, while **AI can improve efficiency**, it may also r**educe critical engagement**, particularly in routine or lower-stakes tasks in which users simply rely on AI, raising concerns about long-term **reliance and diminished independent problem-solving**," the researchers wrote.

The researchers added that data showed a "shift in cognitive effort" as knowledge workers moved from completing tasks themselves to overseeing the completion of tasks by generative AI.

When used "improperly," the researchers asserted that technologies could mean the "**deterioration** of **cognitive faculties**."

"A key irony of automation is that by mechanizing routine tasks and leaving exception-handling to the human user, you **deprive** the **user of** the routine **opportunities to practice** their **judgment** and **strengthen** their **cognitive musculature**, l**eaving them atrophied and unprepared when the exceptions do arise,"** they wrote.

It's up to the individual, said Patrick Wilson, an anthropology student at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, to bridle the tech in a way that works for them.

"It's such an incredibly useful tool, it's really hard to just dismiss it based over that one concern," he said. "It's kind of on us to make sure that we're still being critical, and maintaining our abilities. But if I think, if you're using it well, if you're really using it to its full potential, then, by definition, you're doing a lot of critical thinking."

John Keon, who studies finance at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, said that AI is a natural next step in technological evolution and that the further automation of human tasks seems inevitable.

"You don't want to be reliant on this stuff, but at the same time, isn't that kind of like, what technologies, like — sort of the general idea is, it's designed to improve and handle functions that otherwise would take, you know, manpower or horsepower, or labor hours," he said.

Still, Keon **distinguishes** between **academic** and **professional** settings. He said that a **boost** from AI might **be a good thing when you're in the work force**, but that automating your work while still in **university could prove detrimental.**

"**From a productivity standpoint,** if you're in a company, then, yeah, that's **a great thing,"** Keon said. "**But** if you're in an **academic setting**, if you're in a creative setting, I think that boredom and that **brainstorm is a very crucial part of any kind of idea-generating creativity."**
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